

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment filed 12/26/2007.

Claims 1-25 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/11/2007 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: define computer-readable medium. The Examiner does note in ¶0071 of the specification the use of computer-usable medium, but it does not define computer-readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pimentel et al. (US PGPub 2003/0072451).

6. In regards to claim 1 Pimentel et al. disclose, a method comprising:

a. forming a Web service message at a first network entity, the Web service message targeted for a second network entity (**¶0043 line(s) 6-13**);

b. establishing a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Connection-Oriented (CO) Over-The-Air (OTA) push session with the second network entity (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0037 line(s) 7-12, ¶0038 line(s) 12-14**);

c. binding a transport protocol with the WAP CO OTA push session (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15**);

d. sending the Web service message to the second network entity via the WAP CO OTA push session using the transport protocol (**¶0043 line(s) 16-19, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15, ¶0009 line(s) 2-8**);

e. and processing the Web service message at the second network entity (**¶0043 line(s) 18-20**).

7. In regards to claims 3, 9, 14, 18, and 23 Pimentel et al. disclose, wherein the transport protocol includes Hypertext Transport Protocol (HTTP) (**¶0036 line(s) 14-15**).

Art Unit: 2153

8. In regards to claims 4, 10, 15, 19, and 24, Pimentel et al. disclose, wherein the transport protocol includes Wireless Session Protocol (WSP) (**¶0036 line(s) 14-15**).

9. In regards to claim 5 Pimentel et al. disclose, wherein processing the Web service message at the second network entity comprises forming a Web service response message targeted for the first network entity (**¶0044 line(s) 7-10**).

10. In regards to claim 7 Pimentel et al. disclose, a system for providing Web services from a mobile terminal (**¶0046 line(s) 3**), comprising:

f. means for receiving a Web service request message via a network (**¶0043 line(s) 6-13**);

g. means for transmitting the Web service request message via a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Connection-Oriented (CO) Over-The-Air (OTA) push session (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0037 line(s) 7-12, ¶0038 line(s) 12-14**);

h. means for receiving the Web service request message at the mobile terminal via the WAP CO OTA push session (**¶0043 line(s) 16-19, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15, ¶0009 line(s) 2-8**);

i. and means for processing the Web service request message at the mobile terminal (**¶0043 line(s) 18-20**).

11. In regards to claim 12 Pimentel et al. disclose, a mobile terminal wirelessly coupled to a network, comprising:

- j. a transceiver (**Client Stack #54**) configured to facilitate exchange of data with the network via a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Connection-Oriented (CO) Over-The-Air (OTA) push session (**Fig. 5 #54, ¶0038 line(s) 12-14**);
 - k. a memory capable of storing at least one of a data transfer module (**Client Stack #54**) and a Web services processing module (**Client-side adaptor #58**) (**¶0038 line(s) 1-5, ¶0043 line(s) 18-23**);
 - l. and a processor coupled to the memory and the transceiver (**Client Stack #54**), the processor configured by the data transfer module to receive Web service messages targeted for the mobile terminal via the WAP CO OTA push session and communicate the Web service messages to the Web services processing module, the processor configured by the Web services processing module to process the Web service messages (**¶0038**).
12. In regards to claim 16 Pimentel et al. disclose, a computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon which are executable for providing Web services on a mobile terminal comprising by performing steps:
- m. establishing a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Connection-Oriented (CO) Over-The-Air (OTA) push session with the second network entity (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0037 line(s) 7-12, ¶0038 line(s) 12-14**);
 - n. binding a transport protocol with the WAP CO OTA push session (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15**);

Art Unit: 2153

- o. receiving a Web service message from the network entity via the WAP CO OTA push session using the transport protocol (**0043 line(s) 16-19, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15, ¶0009 line(s) 2-8**);
 - p. and processing the Web service message (**¶0043 line(s) 18-20**).
13. In regards to claim 21 Pimentel et al. disclose, a server (**Fig. 5 #48**) coupled to a network (**Fig. 5 #42**) and used to facilitate communications with a wireless terminal (**Fig. 5 #52**), comprising:
- q. means for receiving a Web service message targeted for the wireless terminal via the network (**¶0043 line(s) 4-6**);
 - r. means for initiating a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) Connection-Oriented (CO) Over-The-Air (OTA) push session with the wireless terminal (**¶0043 line(s) 14-17, ¶0037 line(s) 7-12, ¶0038 line(s) 12-14**);
 - s. and means for sending the Web service message to the wireless terminals via the WAP CO OTA push session (**0043 line(s) 16-19, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15, ¶0009 line(s) 2-8**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

16. Claims 2, 8, 13, 17, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pimentel et al. (US PGPub 2003/0072451) as applied to claims 1, 7,

13, 17, and 35 above, and further in view of Mulligan et al. (US PGPub 2003/0095540).

17. In regards to claims 2, 8, 13, 17, and 22 Pimentel et al. do not teach, wherein the Web service message includes a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) message.

18. In the same field of endeavor Mulligan et al. teach facilitating the transmission of push messages from network applications to mobile terminals (**¶0009**). Wherein the web service messages are SOAP messages (**¶0046 line(s) 4-9**).

19. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pimentel et al. method and apparatus for securely transferring wireless data with Mulligan et al. teaching as discussed above to allow for

Art Unit: 2153

the capability of transmitting web service messages in a variety type of protocols to be able to communicate with varies mobile devices.

20. Claims 6, 11, 20, and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pimentel et al. (US PGPub 2003/0072451) as applied to claims 1, 7, 17, and 35 above, and further in view of Suryanarayana (US PGPub 2002/0155848).

21. In regards to claim 6 Pimentel et al. do not teach, sending the Web service response message targeted for the first network entity via the WAP CO OTA push session using the transport protocol.

22. In the same field of endeavor Suryanarayana's teach establishing a WAP CO OTA push session, with two entities (**fig. 3 #100, #310**) over a network (**fig. 3. #305**), using a WAP Proxy (**fig. 3#301**) and a WAP Push Proxy Gateway (**fig. 3 #315**), for transmitting web services with each other. Wherein the response is sent back using the same push session transport protocol (**¶0049, ¶0058**).

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pimentel et al. method and apparatus for securely transferring wireless data with Suryanarayana's teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of establishing one session for ease of sharing and viewing the same information.

24. In regards to claim 11 Pimentel et al. disclose, a means for forming a Web service response message at the mobile terminal in response to the Web service request message (**¶0044 line(s) 7-10**).

25. Pimentel et al. do not teach means for transmitting the Web service response message from the mobile terminal via the server initiated wireless push session.

26. In the same field of endeavor Suryanarayana's teach establishing a WAP CO OTA push session, with two entities (**fig. 3 #100, #310**) over a network (**fig. 3. #305**), using a WAP Proxy (**fig. 3#301**) and a WAP Push Proxy Gateway (**fig. 3 #315**), for transmitting web services with each other. Wherein the response is sent back using the same push session transport protocol (**¶0049, ¶0058**).

27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pimentel et al. method and apparatus for securely transferring wireless data with Suryanarayana's teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of establishing one session for ease of sharing and viewing the same information.

28. In regards to claim 20 Pimentel et al. disclose, forming a Web service response message based on the Web service message (**¶0044 line(s) 7-10**).

29. Pimentel et al. do not teach sending the Web service response message to the second network entity via the server-initiated wireless push session.

30. In the same field of endeavor Suryanarayana's teach establishing a WAP CO OTA push session, with two entities (**fig. 3 #100, #310**) over a network (**fig. 3. #305**), using a WAP Proxy (**fig. 3#301**) and a WAP Push Proxy Gateway (**fig. 3 #315**), for transmitting web services with each other. Wherein the response is sent back using the same push session transport protocol (**¶0049, ¶0058**).

31. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pimentel et al. method and apparatus for securely transferring wireless data with Suryanarayana's teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of establishing one session for ease of sharing and viewing the same information.

32. In regards to claim 25 Pimentel et al. do not teach, means for receiving a Web service response message from the wireless terminal via the server-initiated push session; and means for communicating the Web service response messages to an originator of the Web service message via the network.

33. In the same field of endeavor Suryanarayana's teach establishing a WAP CO OTA push session (**fig. 4 #405 - #417**), with two entities (**fig. 3 #100, #310**) over a

network (**fig. 3. #305**), using a WAP Proxy (**fig. 3#301**) and a WAP Push Proxy Gateway (**fig. 3 #315**), for transmitting web services with each other. Wherein the response is sent back, to the originator, using the same push session transport protocol, via the network (**¶0049, ¶0058**).

34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pimentel et al. method and apparatus for securely transferring wireless data with Suryanarayana's teaching as discussed above to allow for the capability of establishing one session for ease of sharing and viewing the same information.

Response to Arguments

35. Applicant's arguments filed 12/26/207, for claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 21, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues, "...that none of the transactions being described in paragraphs 0043-0044 (or elsewhere) in Pimentel expressly or inherently describe a Web service message being sent via WAP CO OTA." The Examine has interpreted the email notification transmitted by the server to the client, as a web service message, as taught by Pimentel (**¶0043 line(s) 4-12**). Being that email is a web service. Likewise, the Examine notes that Pimentel does disclose the gateway transmitting via WAP CO OTA (**¶0043 line(s) 16-19, ¶0036 line(s) 11-15, ¶0009 line(s) 2-8**).

36. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to La Juania N. Mouzon whose telephone number is 571-270-3045. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00-5:00, 1st Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Glenton B. Burgess/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2153

